

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,420,780 to Deckert. Applicant has cancelled independent Claim 1, without prejudice, in favor of new independent Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it applies to new independent Claim 8 and associated dependent Claim 5.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the features defined in new independent Claim 8. More specifically, the Deckert reference fails to disclose a magneto-optical storage device that includes, *inter alia*, a floating slider with a light condenser mounted thereon, as now recited in independent Claim 8. Instead, the Deckert reference relates to a head slider for a storage device with a magnetic disc, where such a head slider lacks a light condenser because it is unnecessary for use with a magnetic disc. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of Claims 8 and 5.

Claim 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Deckert in view of United States Patent No. 5,253,232 to Akagi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 8, and therefore includes all of the features of Claim 8, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection of dependent Claim 2 be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 8, and also because the Akagi et al. reference does not remedy

the deficiency discussed above. More specifically, the Akagi et al. reference only includes a single object lens 5 (Figure 1A), and this lens is not supported by the slider, as recited in independent Claim 8. Accordingly, all of the features of Claim 8 (from which Claim 2 depends) are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of dependent Claim 2.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Deckert in view of United States Patent No. 5,748,408 to Barrois et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent Claim 8, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 8, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection of dependent Claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 8, and also because the Barrois et al. reference does not remedy the deficiency discussed above. More specifically, the Barrois et al. reference only relates to a slider, and fails to mention a lens supported by the slider, as recited in independent Claim 8. Accordingly, all of the features of Claim 8 (from which Claims 3 and 4 depend) are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of dependent Claims 3 and 4.

Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Deckert. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends from independent Claim 8, and therefore includes all of the features of Claim 8, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

that this §103 rejection of dependent Claim 6 be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 8, and also because the Deckert reference does not suggest any remedy the deficiency discussed above. Accordingly, all of the features of Claim 8 (from which Claim 6 depends) are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of dependent Claim 6.


Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0008502 to Watanabe in view of Deckert. Applicants have cancelled Claim 7, without prejudice, in favor of incorporating the subject matter of this claim into new independent Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it applies to new independent Claim 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a magneto-optical storage device with a slider that includes, *inter alia*, a first object lens that is movable relative to a fixed piece that is fixed to the substrate of the slider, as defined in independent Claim 8. Instead, although the Watanabe reference includes two lenses, neither lens is disclosed as being movable relative to the slider (or relative to a fixed piece incorporated in the slider). Additionally, as mentioned above, the Deckert reference fails to disclose a lens. Accordingly, as all of the features of independent Claim 8 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claim 8.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
James K. Folker
Registration No. 37,538

October 30, 2007

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1109\70960\CS6075.DOC